

To: McEwan, Dennis@DWR[Dennis.McEwan@water.ca.gov]
From: Vendlinski, Tim
Sent: Wed 11/5/2014 11:32:16 PM
Subject: FW: BDCP: revised list of issues for resolution [roadmap for technical and policy meetings] + topics for NOV 10th "habitat" meeting
BDCP DWR esolution Process 110514.docx

From: Vendlinski, Tim
Sent: Wednesday, November 05, 2014 12:57 PM
To: Enos, Cassandra@DWR (Cassandra.Enos@water.ca.gov)
Subject: BDCP: revised list of issues for resolution [roadmap for technical and policy meetings] + topics for NOV 10th "habitat" meeting

Thanks so much for your time this morning, Cassandra.

I appreciate "the roadmap" document and the specifics for next Monday.

I'll pass along the roadmap to members of the Bay Delta Team here at EPA, and I recommend that you or somebody from DWR circulate the document to our interagency colleagues so everyone has a common frame of reference.

Further, I appreciate your openness toward documenting areas of agreement & disagreement, areas of misunderstanding, and areas where the agencies agree to disagree.

I suggest that these meetings be carefully "co-facilitated" by the participants so, together, we can move the process forward despite our likely differences.

Everyone should be able to leave the meetings with a common understanding of what just happened, and they should have common expectations for action items and next steps.

See you soon! Tim

><(((0>..~'..><(((0>..~'..><(((0>

Tim Vendlinski

Senior Policy Advisor;

Bay Delta Program Manager

EPA Region 9

75 Hawthorne Street (WTR-1)

San Francisco, CA 94105-3901

(415) 972-3469 desk

><(((0>..~..><(((0>..~..><(((0>

From: Enos, Cassandra@DWR [<mailto:Cassandra.Enos@water.ca.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, November 05, 2014 11:53 AM
To: Vendlinski, Tim
Cc: Foresman, Erin
Subject: Revised list of issues for resolution

Tim - It was nice talking with you this morning. I think we are on the same page with respect to goals for these meetings. As you requested, I've attached an updated list of issues that incorporates all of EPA's edits, with the exception of the groundwater mitigation issue. I'm proposing using these bullet points as the topics for each of the upcoming meetings. Please let me know if you have any additional edits. I've added some text regarding the goals of the meetings that I think captures what we discussed.

Thanks, Cassandra

From: Enos, Cassandra@DWR [<mailto:Cassandra.Enos@water.ca.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, November 05, 2014 11:40 AM
To: Foresman, Erin
Cc: Vendlinski, Tim
Subject: FW: Topics for Nov 10th mtg

Erin – Below is the list of discussion items for the meeting on the 10th.

This includes the EPA revisions to the list we sent. I am planning on using this list to develop the agenda.

I just wondered if you wanted to make any further edits?

Also, it looks like we will be holding the meeting at ICF's offices. I'll include that in the agenda, but just wanted to give you a heads up.

Thanks, C.

Topics for Discussion:

- EPA concerned that DEIS does not fully define and describe the relevance of the estuarine salinity gradient or report a year-round salinity gradient/Delta outflow analysis for each alternative.
- EPA concerned that DEIS does not describe potential effects on DO and other contaminant concentrations as a result of more frequent dead pool conditions in upstream reservoirs
- EPA concerns over sole reliance on habitat restoration for ecosystem recovery, recognizing that existing freshwater diversions and significantly diminished seaward flows have played a significant role in precluding the recovery of Bay Delta ecosystem processes and declining fish populations.
- EPA concerned that CM1 alternatives may contribute to declining populations of delta smelt, longfin smelt, green sturgeon, and winter-run, spring-run, fall-run, and late fall-run salmon and may not be mitigated by restoration. Restoration success assumed to be 100% in the DEIR/EIS. Less than 100% success may influence salinity results.
- EPA concerned that there is a potential for conflict with other HCPs.
- EPA concern that modeled longfin smelt abundance is estimated to decline for all but one of the alternatives, juvenile delta smelt entrainment is predicted to increase under Alt 4, and believes that delta smelt rearing habitat should be expressed in absolute terms. EPA requests more detail regarding how north Delta diversion screens would prevent entrainment.
- How will NEPA effects determinations be revised in light of this discussion for beneficial use impairments?

Cassandra Enos-Nobriga

Environmental Management

Bay-Delta Conservation Plan

Department of Water Resources

901 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

Office: (916) 651-0178

Mobile: (916) 835-6981

